



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

(b)(6)




DATE: JUN 26 2013 OFFICE: TEXAS SERVICE CENTER



IN RE: Petitioner: [Redacted]
Beneficiary: [Redacted]

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to Section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen in accordance with the instructions on Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Ron Rosenberg
Acting Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Texas Service Center, denied the employment-based immigrant visa petition, which is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an information technology consulting firm. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as a programmer analyst. As required by statute, an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, approved by the Department of Labor (DOL), accompanied the petition.¹ Upon reviewing the petition, the director determined that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that the beneficiary satisfied the minimum level of education stated on the labor certification.

The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004). The AAO considers all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.²

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States. Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)(A)(ii), also provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and are members of the professions. In the instant case, the petitioner indicated on the Form I-140 petition that it was requesting the professional classification.

To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the education, training, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's priority date. *See Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the ETA Form 9089 was accepted for processing on March 11, 2011.³ The Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker (Form I-140) was filed on October 19, 2011.

¹ On March 28, 2005, pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 656.17, the Application for Permanent Employment Certification, ETA Form 9089 replaced the Application for Alien Employment Certification, Form ETA 750. The new Form ETA 9089 was introduced in connection with the re-engineered permanent foreign labor certification program (PERM), which was published in the Federal Register on December 27, 2004 with an effective date of March 28, 2005. *See* 69 Fed. Reg. 77326 (Dec. 27, 2004).

² The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to the Form I-290B, which are incorporated into the regulations by the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

³ If the petition is approved, the priority date is also used in conjunction with the Visa Bulletin issued by the Department of State to determine when a beneficiary can apply for adjustment of status or for an

The proffered position's requirements are found on ETA Form 9089 Part H. This section of the application for alien labor certification, "Job Opportunity Information," describes the terms and conditions of the job offered. It is important that the ETA Form 9089 be read as a whole. The instructions for the ETA Form 9089, Part H, provide:

Minimum Education, Training, and Experience Required to Perform the Job Duties. Do not duplicate the time requirements. For example, time required in training should not also be listed in education or experience. Indicate whether months or years are required. Do not include restrictive requirements which are not actual business necessities for performance on the job and which would limit consideration of otherwise qualified U.S. workers.

On the ETA Form 9089, the "job offer" position description for a programmer analyst provides [sic throughout]:

Plan, direct or coordinate activities in such field as electronics data processing, information systems, system analysis and computer programming must have knowledge or Proficiency & experience in Implementing ONE/SOME OR ALL of SAP, Oracle App, Peoplesoft, Oracle, SQL Server, Ebusiness App Development tools such as Java, J2EE, .NET, C++, PL/SQL, Unix and BI tools such as Cognos, SAS, Informatica, IBM Websphere Datastage, Microstrategy, Hyperion, SAP Business objects, SAP BW, C#, ASP.NET, VB, C# VC++, AJAX, Javascript, VB, SQL Server, Sybase, Perl, MSAccess

Regarding the minimum level of education and experience required for the proffered position in this matter, Part H of the labor certification reflects the following requirements:

- H.4. Education: Minimum level required: Bachelor's degree.
- 4-B. Major Field Study: Computer Science, Engineering, MIS, Science or Business Administration.
7. Is there an alternate field of study that is acceptable.
- The petitioner checked "no" to this question.
8. Is there an alternate combination of education and experience that is acceptable?
- The petitioner checked "no" to this question.

immigrant visa abroad. Thus, the importance of reviewing the *bona fides* of a job opportunity as of the priority date is clear.

9. Is a foreign educational equivalent acceptable?

The petitioner listed "yes" that a foreign educational equivalent would be accepted.

6. Experience: None required.

14. Specific skills or other requirements: Any combination of education equivalent to US Bachelors is acceptable.

To determine whether a beneficiary is eligible for a preference immigrant visa, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) must ascertain whether the alien is, in fact, qualified for the certified job. USCIS will not accept a degree equivalency or an unrelated degree when a labor certification plainly and expressly requires a candidate with a specific degree. In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. *See Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008; *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006; *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981).

On the ETA Form 9089, signed by the beneficiary on August 8, 2011, the beneficiary represented that the highest level of achieved education related to the requested occupation was a Bachelor of Science degree. He listed the institution of study where that education was obtained as [REDACTED], and the year completed as 1997.

In support of the beneficiary's educational qualifications, the petitioner submitted a copy of the beneficiary's diploma from [REDACTED]. It indicates that the beneficiary was awarded a Bachelor of Science on November 28, 1998. The petitioner also submitted a Diploma from [REDACTED] Computer Training Centre stating that he was awarded a Post Graduate Diploma (PGD) in Computer Application on June 29, 1998. The petitioner additionally submitted two credentials evaluations, dated November 6, 2012 from [REDACTED], and an October 2011 evaluation from [REDACTED]. Both evaluations conclude that the combination of the beneficiary's Bachelor of Science diploma from [REDACTED] is equivalent to a Bachelor of Science degree in Computer Science in the United States.

The director denied the petition on November 20, 2012. He determined that the beneficiary's Bachelor of Science degree could not be accepted as a foreign equivalent degree to a U.S. bachelor's degree in Computer Science, MIS, Science, or Business Administration because the beneficiary's PGD was not issued by an accredited institution so the beneficiary had only three years of collegiate level education in pursuit of the degree from [REDACTED] University, so did not hold the minimum requirements of a U.S. bachelor's degree.

On appeal, with regard to the beneficiary's qualifying academic credentials, counsel submitted advertisements placed as part of the recruitment process and a previous, unpublished AAO decision; counsel also re-submitted the credential evaluations.

On the Form I-140, the petitioner checked Box 2.e. indicating that the petition was being filed for a professional, which requires a bachelor's degree or a foreign degree equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree.⁴

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) states the following:

If the petition is for a professional, the petition must be accompanied by evidence that the alien holds a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree and by evidence that the alien is a member of the professions. Evidence of a baccalaureate degree shall be in the form of an official college or university record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study. To show that the alien is a member of the professions, the petitioner must submit evidence that the minimum of a baccalaureate degree is required for entry into the occupation.

The above regulation uses a singular description of foreign equivalent degree. Thus, the plain meaning of the regulatory language concerning the professional classification sets forth the requirement that a beneficiary must produce one degree that is determined to be the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate degree in order to be qualified as a professional for third preference visa category purposes.

On August 22, 2012, the director issued a request for evidence (RFE) to the petitioner. In this request, the director noted the beneficiary's studies with [REDACTED] Training Centre. The RFE noted that the ETA Form 9089 provided that "any combination" of education equivalent to a U.S. bachelor's degree would be accepted, but that the labor certification did not define the term "any combination." The RFE requested evidence of the petitioner's job advertisement and recruitment process to demonstrate what the petitioner considered to be an acceptable combination of education to meet the minimum requirements of the position. The RFE also requested evidence to demonstrate that the beneficiary's PGD was issued by an accredited institution by the All-India Council for Technical Education (AICTE).

⁴ In response to the director's RFE, counsel asserted that the petition should be considered under the skilled worker category should USCIS find that the labor certification requires less than a bachelor's degree. A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition in an effort to make a deficient petition conform to USCIS requirements. See *Matter of Izummi*, 22 I&N Dec. 169, 176 (Assoc. Comm'r 1988). The labor certification unequivocally requires a U.S. bachelor's degree or its educational equivalent.

At the outset, it is noted that section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act and the scope of the regulation at 20 C.F.R. § 656.1(a) describe the role of the DOL in the labor certification process as follows:

In general.-Any alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor is inadmissible, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General that-

(I) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified (or equally qualified in the case of an alien described in clause (ii)) and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and

(II) the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed.

It is left to USCIS to determine whether the proffered position and alien qualify for a specific immigrant classification or even the job offered. This fact has not gone unnoticed by Federal Circuit Courts:

There is no doubt that the authority to make preference classification decisions rests with INS. The language of section 204 cannot be read otherwise. *See Castaneda-Gonzalez v. INS*, 564 F.2d 417, 429 (D.C. Cir. 1977). In turn, DOL has the authority to make the two determinations listed in section 212(a)(14).⁵ *Id.* at 423. The necessary result of these two grants of authority is that section 212(a)(14) determinations are not subject to review by INS absent fraud or willful misrepresentation, but all matters relating to preference classification eligibility not expressly delegated to DOL remain within INS' authority.

* * *

Given the language of the Act, the totality of the legislative history, and the agencies' own interpretations of their duties under the Act, we must conclude that Congress did not intend DOL to have primary authority to make any determinations other than the two stated in section 212(a)(14). If DOL is to analyze alien qualifications, it is for the purpose of "matching" them with those of corresponding United States workers so that it will then be "in a position to meet the requirement of the law," namely the section 212(a)(14) determinations.

Madany v. Smith, 696 F.2d 1008, 1012-1013 (D.C. Cir. 1983).⁶

⁵ Based on revisions to the Act, the current citation is section 212(a)(5)(A) as set forth above.

⁶ The Ninth Circuit, citing *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006, has stated:

The Department of Labor ("DOL") must certify that insufficient domestic workers are available to perform the job and that the alien's performance of the job will not

In 1991, when the final rule for 8 C.F.R. § 204.5 was published in the Federal Register, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (now USCIS or the Service), responded to criticism that the regulation required an alien to have a bachelor's degree as a minimum and that the regulation did not allow for the substitution of experience for education. After reviewing section 121 of the Immigration Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-649 (1990), and the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference, the Service specifically noted that both the Act and the legislative history indicate that an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree: "[B]oth the Act and its legislative history make clear that, in order to qualify as a professional under the third classification or to have experience equating to an advanced degree under the second, *an alien must have at least a bachelor's degree.*" 56 Fed. Reg. 60897, 60900 (November 29, 1991)(emphasis added).

There is no provision in the statute or the regulations that would allow a beneficiary to qualify under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act with anything less than a full baccalaureate degree. More specifically, a three-year bachelor's degree will not be considered to be the "foreign equivalent degree" to a United States baccalaureate degree. Where the analysis of the beneficiary's credentials relies on work experience alone or a combination of multiple lesser degrees, the result is the "equivalent" of a bachelor's degree rather than a single-source "foreign equivalent degree." In order to have experience and education equating to a bachelor's degree under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, the beneficiary must have a single degree that is the "foreign equivalent degree" to a United States baccalaureate degree.

We note the decision in *Snapnames.com, Inc. v. Michael Chertoff*, 2006 WL 3491005 (D. Or. November 30, 2006). In that case, the labor certification application specified an educational requirement of four years of college and a 'B.S. or foreign equivalent.' The district court determined that 'B.S. or foreign equivalent' relates solely to the alien's educational background, precluding consideration of the alien's combined education and work experience. *Id.* at *11-13. Additionally, the court determined that the word 'equivalent' in the employer's educational requirements was ambiguous and that in the context of skilled worker petitions (where there is no statutory educational requirement), deference must be given to the employer's intent. *Id.* at *14. However, in professional and advanced degree professional cases, where the beneficiary is statutorily required to hold a baccalaureate degree, the court determined that USCIS properly concluded that a single foreign degree or its equivalent is required. *Id.* at *17, 19. In the instant case, unlike the labor certification

adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed domestic workers. *Id.* § 212(a)(14), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(14). The INS then makes its own determination of the alien's entitlement to sixth preference status. *Id.* § 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). See generally *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 9th Cir.1983).

The INS, therefore, may make a de novo determination of whether the alien is in fact qualified to fill the certified job offer.

Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman, 736 F. 2d 1305, 1309 (9th Cir. 1984).

in *Snapnames.com, Inc.*, the petitioner's intent regarding educational equivalence is clearly stated on the ETA 9089 and does not include alternatives to a four-year bachelor's degree. The court in *Snapnames.com, Inc.* recognized that even though the labor certification may be prepared with the alien in mind, USCIS has an independent role in determining whether the alien meets the labor certification requirements. *Id.* at *7. Thus, the court concluded that where the plain language of those requirements does not support the petitioner's asserted intent, USCIS "does not err in applying the requirements as written." *Id.* See also *Maramjaya v. USCIS*, Civ. Act No. 06-2158 (RCL) (D.C. Cir. March 26, 2008) (upholding an interpretation that a "bachelor's or equivalent" requirement necessitated a single four-year degree). In this matter, the ETA Form 9089 does not specify an equivalency to the requirement of a Bachelor of Science degree.

In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. See *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008; *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006; *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981). Where the job requirements in a labor certification are not otherwise unambiguously prescribed, e.g., by professional regulation, USCIS must examine "the language of the labor certification job requirements" in order to determine what the petitioner must demonstrate that the beneficiary has to be found qualified for the position. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. The only rational manner by which USCIS can be expected to interpret the meaning of terms used to describe the requirements of a job in a labor certification is to "examine the certified job offer exactly as it is completed by the prospective employer." *Rosedale Linden Park Company v. Smith*, 595 F. Supp. 829, 833 (D.D.C. 1984)(emphasis added). USCIS's interpretation of the job's requirements, as stated on the labor certification must involve "reading and applying the plain language of the [labor certification application form]." *Id.* at 834 (emphasis added). USCIS cannot and should not reasonably be expected to look beyond the plain language of the labor certification that DOL has formally issued or otherwise attempt to divine the employer's intentions through some sort of reverse engineering of the labor certification.

Moreover, for classification as a member of the professions, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(l)(3)(ii)(C) requires the submission of "an official college or university record showing the date the baccalaureate degree was awarded and the area of concentration of study." (Emphasis added.) Moreover, it is significant that both the statute, section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act, and relevant regulations use the word "degree" in relation to professionals. A statute should be construed under the assumption that Congress intended it to have purpose and meaningful effect. *Mountain States Tel. & Tel. v. Pueblo of Santa Ana*, 472 U.S. 237, 249 (1985); *Sutton v. United States*, 819 F.2d 1289, 1295 (5th Cir. 1987). It can be presumed that Congress' narrow requirement of a "degree" for members of the professions is deliberate. Significantly, in another context, Congress has broadly referenced "the possession of a degree, diploma, certificate, or similar award from a college, university, school, or other institution of learning." Section 203(b)(2)(C) (relating to aliens of exceptional ability). Thus, the requirement at section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) that an eligible alien both have a baccalaureate "degree" and be a member of the professions reveals that member of the profession must have a *degree* and that a diploma or certificate from an institution of learning other than a college or university is a potentially similar but distinct type of credential. Thus, even if we

did not require “a” degree that is the foreign equivalent of a U.S. baccalaureate, we could not consider education earned at an institution other than a college or university.

The petitioner maintains, correctly, that the beneficiary’s three-year Bachelor of Science degree from [REDACTED] University is equivalent to three years of university study in the United States. The issue presented is whether the beneficiary’s PGD from [REDACTED] amounts to a year of baccalaureate study at an accredited U.S. institution to amount to a full four-year U.S. baccalaureate degree.

The petitioner submitted no evidence that [REDACTED] is accredited by AICTE. Instead, counsel cites to the credential evaluations submitted as proof that the beneficiary has the required education as of the priority date. The evaluation submitted from [REDACTED] states [REDACTED] which is “approve[d]” by the Department of Rural Development, Government of India. The evaluation from [REDACTED] “is a competitive institution” and that the program “significantly parallel[s] those parameters upheld by accredited colleges and universities of precedence in the United States.”

USCIS may, in its discretion, use as advisory opinions statements submitted as expert testimony. However, where an opinion is not in accord with other information or is in any way questionable, the Service is not required to accept or may give less weight to that evidence. *Matter of Caron International*, 19 I&N Dec. 791 (Comm. 1988); see also *Matter of D-R-*, 25 I&N Dec. 445 (BIA 2011) (expert witness testimony may be given different weight depending on the extent of the expert’s qualifications or the relevance, reliability, and probative value of the testimony).

AICTE was established in November 1945 as a “national level Apex Advisory Body to conduct survey[s] on the facilities on technical education and to promote development in the country in a coordinated and integrated manner.” See <http://www.aicte-india.org/aboutus.htm> (accessed June 21, 2013). AICTE has the “statutory authority for planning, formulation and maintenance of norms and standards, quality assurance through accreditation, funding in priority areas, monitoring and evaluation, maintaining parity of certification and awards and ensuring coordinated and integrated development and management of technical education in the country.” *Id.* As AICTE ensures the foundation of norms and standards, the educational value of an unaccredited institution cannot be properly assessed.

Further, the AAO notes that based on a review of the AICTE website, [REDACTED] India is not an accredited institution within the state of [REDACTED] India, or within any other Indian state. See <http://www.nba-aicte.ernet.in/nmna.htm> (accessed June 21, 2013).

Counsel is correct in asserting that the award of a PGD following a three-year degree can be equivalent to a United States bachelor’s degree, however, qualifying educational degrees must be awarded by an accredited program. As stated above, AICTE ensures norms and standards to verify that an educational program is equivalent to a U.S. program. Without such an accreditation, we are unable to ascertain the rigor of the program to accurately compare it to the equivalent of a U.S.

degree as specified on the labor certification. As a result, the petitioner demonstrated that the beneficiary has the equivalent of three years of baccalaureate education at a U.S. program, but not that the beneficiary possesses the equivalent of a U.S. four-year bachelor's degree.

Although the labor certification and the petitioner's recruitment materials establish that it would accept an equivalent to a U.S. baccalaureate degree, the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary possesses such an equivalency. The beneficiary does not have a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree, and, thus, does not qualify for preference visa classification under section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.